aHON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE G. YETHIRAJULU

W.P.No.19779 of 2004

Dated this the 24th day of December, 2007

Between:

Inuganti Satya Sreeranga Srinvivas
and 8 others … Petitioners

AND

The Govt. of A.P., rep.by its Secretary,
Endowments Department, Secretariat Buildings,
Hyderabad, and 4 others
… Respondents

HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE G. YETHIRAJULU

W.P.No.19779 of 2004

ORDER:

This Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioners seeking to declare that the orders passed by the second respondent-Regional Joint Commissioner of Endowments, Kakinada, in appeal No.141 of 2004 and batch, dated 21.09.2004 that the lands taken on lease by the petitioners are wet lands and the petitioners are not landless poor persons are illegal and arbitrary.

2) The petitioners are contending that they are landless poor persons, but the contents of the writ petition clearly indicates that each petitioner is in possession of more than 2 ½ acres of land and more and the land is classified as wet land in the revenue records. They obtained a certificate from the Mandal Revenue Officer to the effect that though the lands are classified as wet lands in the village accounts, due to lack of continuous supply of water from the Pampa Reservoir Project for the last three years due to frequent failure of rains dry crops are being raised in the above lands. The water will not be available for one year out of every three years. But, the Mandal Revenue Officer did not mention as to what were the crops that were raised during that year in which the reservoir water is not available. The petitioners also did not mention as to what were the crops raised by them though it is contended that they were dry lands.

3) After going through the averments made in the writ petition, and the orders passed by the second respondent, I am convinced that the orders passed by the second respondent are supported by sufficient reasons. Therefore, he rightly came to the conclusion that the petitioners are not landless poor persons as defined under Section 82 (2) of the Endowments Act. I do not find any merits in the writ petition and the petitioners are not entitled to any relief through this writ petition.

4) Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

_____

Dr.G. YETHIRAJULU, J

Date: 24-12-2007
lsn